

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending and stand rejected. In view of the following remarks, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's thoughtful reconsideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 101: The Examiner rejected Claims 13-24 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In view of the amendments to the Specification, that rejection is moot.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102: The Examiner rejected Claims 1-30 under §102 as being anticipated by US Pub. 2002/0116531 to Chu. A §102 rejection is valid only if the cited reference teaches each and every element recited in a rejected Claim.

Chu is directed toward a system for anonymously associating related internet requests mad to a web based customer service program. See Chu Abstract. A given web page includes a link or button to a "WCI system." Chu, paragraph [0046]. Upon a user's manual selection of that button, a request is sent to the WCI system. Chu, paragraph [0046]. That request includes the URL for the given web page along with information that can be used by the WCI system to identify a case number. Chu, paragraphs [0046]-[0052]. The case number relates to a case history, that is, a series of related requests from a particular user. Chu, paragraphs [0046]-[0052]. Chu also mentions that the server used for a user's prior interactions with the WCI system can vary over time for various reasons and that it may be beneficial to identify a given server's IP address. Chu, paragraph [0014].

Claim 1 is directed to a method for coordinating sessions, and, as amended, recites the following acts:

1. providing, from a second server, a second session interface to a client, the second session interface having instructions to send second association data to a third server; and
2. communicating, from the second server, with the third server to identify activity related to a first session interface utilizing the association data, the first session interface having been previously provided to the client from a first server.

To summarize, Claim 1 recites providing, from a second server, a second session interface to a client. That second session interface has instructions to send second association data to a third server. Claim 1 also recites communicating, from the second server, with the third server. The purpose of that communication is to use the association data to identify activity related to a first session interface. That first session interface was previously provided to the client from a first server.

The Examiner mistakenly asserts that Chu, paragraphs [0014], [0046], and [0057] teach “communicating, from the second server, with the third server to identify activity related to a first session interface utilizing the association data, the first session interface having been previously provided to the client from a first server.” To help explain the Examiner’s misunderstanding, those paragraphs are reproduced bellow.

[0014] The server used for a user's prior interactions with a WCI system may also vary over time, for example when a load-balancing host serves as a front-end for a cluster of back-end Web servers. In such cases, it may be beneficial to know which Web server was previously involved for this user's requests. However, the server IP address and port combination does not provide a unique identifier of the target service appearing in the "Host" field of the HTTP header. This is because the cluster of servers may be front-ended by a load-balancer (or perhaps by a reverse proxy) that provides a virtual IP address for the entire cluster. Or, when virtual domain hosting is used (such as when an ISP enables its

subscribers to store their own Web pages on its equipment, yet be addressed using an address allocated to the subscriber), multiple server domains sharing a single server platform are addressed by a single address and port combination.

. . . .

[0046] Reference is now made to FIG. 3, which provides a flowchart depicting logic which may be used to implement preferred embodiments of the present invention. Preferably, the user initiates a request for assistance (or equivalently, for other types of interactions) with a WCI system by clicking on a button or other GUI indicator which is displayed on a Web page (Block 300). (Other invocation techniques may be used as well, including but not limited to interpretation of a spoken command by voice activation software.) In response, an invocation request message is generated and sent to the WCI system, along with information for use with the present invention (Block 305). In preferred embodiments, this information comprises (1) the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) of the currently-viewed Web page and (2) all cookies, if any, that are related to this site. Note that this URL may identify a Web page having either static content or dynamic content. The pertinent cookies are located and sent in the request message using techniques which are well known in the art.

. . . .

[0057] If the test in Block 320 has a positive result (i.e. this request pertains to a new case), then control transfers to Block 315 to create a new case number (as has been described above). Otherwise, when this is a request message for an existing case, processing continues at Block 325 which retrieves the previously-stored case history for this case number.

Chu, paragraphs, [0014], 0046], and [0057].

So, as mentioned above, Chu discusses a user selecting a link on a web page. Presumably that web page has an URL corresponding to a particular server. That link accesses a server for Chu's WCI system. Upon selection of the link, a request is sent to Chu's WCI system. The request includes that URL and data for identifying a case number. The WCI system uses the case number to identify a case history.

The Examiner is equating:

- the web page containing the link, discussed above, with the second session interface recited in Claim 1;
- the server responsible for serving that web page with the second server recited in Claim 1; and
- the server responsible for serving the WCI system with the third server recited in Claim 1.

Chu mentions nothing of any communication between the server responsible for serving the web page with the link and the server responsible for serving the WCI system. In the Context of Claim 1, Chu then mentions nothing of “communicating, from the second server, with the third server” for any reasons whatsoever. Consequently, Chu fails to teach or suggest “communicating, from the second server, with the third server to identify activity related to a first session interface utilizing the association data, the first session interface having been previously provided to the client from a first server.” The Applicant challenges the Examiner to specifically identify any passage in Chu that suggests such a communication between the two servers.

For at least these reasons, Claim, 1 is patentable over Chu as are Claims 2-4 which depend from Claim 1

Claim 5 is directed to a method for coordinating sessions, and as amended recites the following acts:

1. providing, from a first server, a first session interface to a client, the first session interface having instructions to send first association data to a third server;
2. the client sending the first association data to the third server;
3. providing, from a second server, a second session interface to the client, the second session interface having instructions to send second association data to the third server;

4. the client sending the second association data to the third server; and
5. communicating, from the second server, with the third server utilizing the first and second association data to identify activity related to the first session interface.

As above with respect to claim 1, Chu does not teach or suggest “communicating, from the second server, with the third server to identify activity related to a first session interface utilizing the association data, the first session interface having been previously provided to the client from a first server.” For the same reasons, Chu also fails to teach or suggest “communicating, from the second server, with the third server utilizing the first and second association data to identify activity related to the first session interface” as recited in Claim 5.

For at least this reason, Claim 5 and Claims 6-11 which depend from Claim 5, are patentable over Chu.

Claim 12 is directed to a session coordinating method and recites the following acts:

1. providing from a first server a first web page to a client the first web page having instructions to request a web bug from a third server;
2. from the client, requesting the web bug sending a cookie and an URL for the first web page to the third server;
3. providing from a second server a second web page to a client, the second web page having instructions to request the web bug from the third server;
4. from the client, requesting the web bug sending the cookie and an URL for the second web page to the third server;
5. saving the cookie and the URL for the first web page as an entry in an association table maintained from the third server;
6. saving the cookie and the URL for the second web page as an entry in the

association table;

7. from the second server, providing the URL for the second web page to the third server, querying the association table for the cookie in the entry containing the URL for the second web page;
8. from the second server, identifying other entries in the association table containing that cookie;
9. from the second server, identifying, from those entries, the entry containing the URL for the first web page; and
10. identifying activity relating to the first web page using that URL for the first web page.

As above with respect to claim 1, Chu does not teach or suggest “communicating, from the second server, with the third server to identify activity related to a first session interface utilizing the association data, the first session interface having been previously provided to the client from a first server.” For the same reasons, Chu also fails to teach or suggest the interaction between the second and third servers as recited in steps 7-10 above.

Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that the use of a web bug as recited in steps 1-4 above is taught by Chu, paragraphs [0040] and [0046]. Chu mentions nothing at all of web bugs. The Applicant challenges the Examiner to specifically identify any passage from Chu that even hints that the use of a web bug.

For at least these reasons, Claim 12 is patentable over Chu.

Claim 13 is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reason Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 13 and Claims 14-16 which depend from Claim 13.

Claim 17 is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of Claim 5. For at least the same reason Claim 5 is patentable, so are Claim 17 and Claims 18-23 which depend from Claim 17.

Claim 24 is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of Claim 12. For at least the same reason Claim 12 is patentable, so is Claim 24.

Claim 25 is directed to a system reciting elements for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reason Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 25 and Claim 26 which depends from Claim 25.

Claim 27 is directed to a system reciting elements for implementing the method of Claim 5. For at least the same reason Claim 5 is patentable, so are Claim 27 and Claim 28 which depends from Claim 27.

Claim 29 is directed to a system reciting elements for implementing the method of Claim 12. For at least the same reason Claim 12 is patentable, so is Claim 29.

Claim 30 is directed to a system reciting means for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reason Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claim 30.

CONCLUSION: The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1-30 are all felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Gregory Eugene Perkins.

By /Jack H. McKinney/
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

September 25, 2006